

### **REMARKS**

The Examiner's entry of the prior Amendment dated July 28, 2006 and the allowance of claims 1-6, 8 and 9 are noted appreciatively by the applicants.

By way of the amendment instructions above, the subject matter of prior pending claim 14 has been incorporated into independent claim 10. Claim 14 has therefore been cancelled as redundant.

The amendment to claim 10 is believed to address the Examiner's rejections of claims 10, 15 and 16 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as a dried coating layer on the substrate is now recited explicitly therein so as to form the chitosan-coated support member. Withdrawal of such rejections is therefore in order.

Applicants note, however, that the expression in claims 15 and 16 of the prehydrolyzed chitosan being present in the coating layer in an amount "in dry matter" does not necessarily mean that the coating layer per se is "dried". Instead, such an expression is a well known means of characterizing an ingredient in an aqueous medium. Thus, expressing something "in dry matter" is a quantity expression which presumes drying (i.e., removal of water) so that the ingredient of interest – in this case prehydrolyzed chitosan – can be measured quantitatively. Such an expression therefore defines the quantity of an ingredient in an aqueous medium on a dry basis and thus does not necessarily mean that the medium itself is dried. In the interest of advancing prosecution of this application to allowance, however, claim 10 has been amended so as to recite a drying step to form a dried coating layer containing prehydrolyzed chitosan on a support member.

In closing, applicants' undersigned attorney acknowledges that the prior use of the term "mass density" in the Amendment dated July 28, 2006 may have inadvertently introduced confusion into the record for the reasons helpfully noted by the Examiner. Such confusion is regretted. What is important of course is that the prehydrolyzed

**DOMARD et al**  
**Serial No. 10/508,870**  
November 15, 2006

chitosan is present in an amount per unit area (i.e., g/m<sup>2</sup>) which should perhaps have been referred to more accurately as a mass (weight) distribution. Suffice it to say, the comments in the July 28, 2006 Amendment are still applicable since it is entirely possible for the coating layer to have a mass (weight) per unit area as required by claims 2, 15 and 16 and still be present in the coating layer in an amount of at least 80% by weight.

Every effort has been made to advance prosecution of this application to allowance. Therefore, in view of the amendments and remarks above, applicant suggests that all claims are in condition for allowance and Official Notice of the same is solicited.


Should any small matters remain outstanding, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the Applicants' undersigned attorney so that the same may be resolved without the need for an additional written action and reply.

An early and favorable reply on the merits is awaited.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Bryan H. Davidson  
Reg. No. 30,251

BHD:bcf  
901 North Glebe Road, 11<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100